

INFO-HAMS Digest

Tue, 17 Oct 89

Volume 89 : Issue 773

Today's Topics:

cellular phone antennas (antenii??)
ICOM IC-2(AT) Wanted
Instructographs and the like
PL259's: Thanks everybody
YAESU FT-301AD

Date: Tue, 17 Oct 89 15:52:32 EDT
From: rachiele@NADC.ARPA (J. Rachiele)
Subject: cellular phone antennas (antenii??)

Everyone is posting that putting a higher gain antenna on your cellular phone will have no effect, since the controller at the cell will automatically lower your power to the point where you are using the minimum power necessary to complete the connection reliably. I understand that part. But say you are in a valley, far from the cell, and the 6 watts ERP won't quite do the job. With a higher gain antenna, you might get say 9 watts ERP, and just be able to get in clean. Will the controller reduce your power in that case? I wouldn't think so. On the other hand, if you didn't need the full 9 watts it would reduce your power to a lower level. Seems like this would be an advantage as well, especially if you were using one of those portable jobs, with the built in battery. Remember, we're not talking about ham radio here, where you need more power than the other guy so you can talk over him,-;) just the minimum power necessary.

Jim, NE3X
Rachiele@nadc.arpa

Date: 15 Oct 89 22:40:06 GMT
From: virgin!ubbs-nh!noel@decvax.dec.com (N. Del More)
Subject: ICOM IC-2(AT) Wanted

Wanted: ICOM IC-2(AT) Handheld Transcievers. Must be in operating condition. Touchtone pad is not required, exterior condition is not of great concern.

If you have one which you wish to sell please let me know, include your asking price.

Thank you,
Noel

--

Noel B. Del More | decvax!ubbs-nh!noel
17 Meredith Drive | noel@ubbs-nh.mv.com
Nashua, New Hampshire 03063 | It's unix me son! 'taint spozed tah make cents

Date: 17 Oct 89 15:44:42 GMT
From: bbn.com!clements@bbn.com (Bob Clements)
Subject: Instructographs and the like

In article <3451@kitty.UUCP> larry@kitty.UUCP (Larry Lippman) writes:
> However, I got to 13 wpm by other means. NOT by records. NOT by
>listening to W1AW.
> Nope, I learned code *proficiency* through a borrowed, gen-U-wine
>Instructograph [tm]!
>
> Real Ham Radio Operators learn code only with an Instructograph [tm].
>In fact, only a Real Ham Radio Operator knows what an Instructograph [tm]
>*is*. :-)
>
><> Larry Lippman @ Recognition Research Corp. - Uniquex Corp. - Viatran Corp.

Hmmm.

I had similar experience. I got to 20 WPM for the Extra by
listening to W1AW all right, but just barely missed my one minute
of solid copy of ALPHANUMERIC CODE GROUPS at 16 WPM for my
commercial telegraph ticket. I used an Instructograph[tm] to
practice those. Passed it on my second try. This was in 1960
when I was a freshman in high school.

[For those who don't know, the Instructograph used paper tapes
through which a light shined. The tapes had long and short
holes in them making up the characters. I suspect they had a lot
of trouble teaching Morse to the worms that gnawed the holes. :-)
Instructograph was a regular advertiser in QST for years.]

Later, at W1MX, I also used a wonderful device called something
like a Boehme tape keyer. This was a paper tape system which
used only two rows of holes (plus the feed holes) rather than the
five rows used in old Teletypes or eight rows in that new-fangled
ASCII stuff. One row of holes was "Key Down" and the other was
"Key Up". Like so:

0 0 00	0 0 00	<- Key Down
oooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooo		<- Feed holes
0 0 00	0 00 0	<- Key Up

E T A Q

The punch which generated that Morse tape was a true mechanical miracle. It cranked out a variable length of tape for each keystroke, depending on the length of the Morse character. The sender which read the tape had a conical roller. You cranked a gear along the cone to set the WPM speed. I believe W1AW used one of these gadgets, too, before they got computerized.

Bob Clements, K1BC, clements@bbn.com

Date: Tue, 17 Oct 89 09:50:44 EDT
From: Michael Harpe <MEHARP01%ULKYVM.BITNET@CORNELL.CIT.CORNELL.EDU>
Subject: PL259's: Thanks everybody

My thanks to all of you who responded to my question about UHF connector assembly. I have concluded that my cable is the problem. I am going to check different styles of RG-8/X to see if my cable is out of spec.

For the couple of people who thought my cable was the fat RG-8: RG-8 comes in two flavors: 8/X and 8/U. 8/U is the large diameter cable, 8/X supposedly is the same diameter as RG-59 (at least the ARRL Antenna Handbook says it is). I believe I have come across some that is slightly larger. I'll post the exact cable I have and hopefully one you RF engineers out there will have a catalog that can settle this once and for all.

I did have a better time assembling connectors for 8/U after the responses. A new chisel-type soldering tip helped greatly.

Thanks again and 73!

"Just STOP your pathetic whining!" - David Letterman

Michael Harpe, N4PLE	BITNET: MEHARP01@ULKYVM
316B Ormsby Building	VOICE: 502-588-7785
University of Louisville	FAX: 502-588-5048
Louisville, KY 40292	AURAL: "Mike!"

Disclaimer: Your actual weight loss may vary

Date: 17 Oct 89 16:11:02 GMT
From: shlump.nac.dec.com!delni.enet.dec.com!goldstein@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: YAESU FT-301AD

In article <566@ka3adu.UUCP>, dave@ka3adu.UUCP (dave hultberg) writes...
>I have been offered a fellow ham's entire hf station. He is tired of hf and
>shifting to VHF packet. The transceiver in the deal is a Yaesu FT-301AD.
>Does anyone have any experience with this rig? Any info pro or con is welcome
>including suggested prices. The package price looks too good to pass up, but
>I would like to get a little more info on the rig. I think it is 10-80m ham
>bands only and 100 watts. That is all I know. I don't know how old the rig
>is or even if it is tube or solid state.

>73 de Dave KA3UZR

Funny you should ask. I have an FT301D. I don't know about the AD, but the 301 had a 10-watt and 100-watt analog version, and my -D is a 100-watt digital readout version. I don't know if there's a 10-watt digital edition.

In any case, it was built ca. 1977 and was the "black front" design that matches the FT-221 (which I also have). These are all solid state (the 101ZD, its contemporary, had tube finals) and cover 160-10 complete including 11, but without the newer 30, 17 and 12 meter bands. The JJY/WWV position is fixed-frequency at 5 MHz and not an easy slot for conversion, though I've thought about trying to recycle that position on the bandswitch.

It uses a genuine analog VFO, which means it has low phase noise, much better than anything (synthesized) Yazoo has made since! The digital readout makes it look like a modern rig. Only one VFO, though (unless you have the outboard) and only about 2 kHz RIT range. The front end is good 'n tight -- it's very hard to overload. That matters where I live. The transmitter is said to sound pretty clean too.

The only "tune-up" is the driver/preselector peaking knob. The 500 Hz CW filter is okay, though it lacks newer features like PBT (it has a notch, though, which is okay too). It also has an FSK position which I haven't used, plus AM.

All told it's not a bad rig at all if you don't mind missing a few new bands. I've worked over a hundred countries just with a dipole, and I'm hardly a hard core DXer. It's probably worth around \$300-400 today, depending on options, but I'm not sure.

fred k1io

End of INFO-HAMS Digest V89 Issue #773
